

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment and the following remarks are intended to fully respond to the Final Office Action dated September 12, 2005. In that Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-7 and 15-42 were examined, and all claims were rejected. More specifically, claims 1-3, 5-7 and 15-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lei et al. (USPN 6,487,552), hereinafter “Lei.” In this Response, claims 1-3, 5-7 and 15-42 have been cancelled and new claims 43-75 have been added.

Interview Summary

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Baoquoc N. To for his candid and helpful discussion of the present application in the telephone interview conducted February 9, 2006 at 1:00 p.m. EST. During the interview, Applicant’s representative, Tadd F. Wilson, and Examiner To reviewed the application. Examiner To elucidated his interpretation of the claims and how the claims are anticipated by the asserted prior art. Finally, Mr. Wilson and Mr. To discussed the features not anticipated by the asserted prior art, and Mr. To suggested possible amendments to the claims that would provide allowable material. The proposed amendments are as shown in the above amendments to the claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 15-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lei. Applicant respectfully traverses the § 102(b) rejections because the current amendments to the claims now render the Examiner's arguments moot. A prima facie case of anticipation can be met only where the reference teaches each and every aspect of the claimed invention. See MPEP §§ 706.02 & 2136. Lei fails to teach a system for managing configuration information in a COM environment as defined by the claims.

The management of configuration information, e.g., specific properties of applications, components, services, and available resources, in a distributed computer environment can be problematic in existing approaches. Programmers generally require access to registry information to directly manipulate the configuration information stored in the registry. Unfortunately, allowing direct manipulation causes program complexity and often leads to corrupted configuration information in the registry. In addition, existing approaches cannot accommodate managing configuration information when the configuration information is distributed among multiple datastores, especially if the location and format of the data in the datastores evolves. Existing approaches lack format and location independence.

To ameliorate these problems, the present invention as defined in the claims relates to an object hierarchy system that abstracts configuration information. Embodiments of the present invention comprise a computer storage medium with components to manage Component Object Model (COM) configuration information in either a runtime environment or a configuration-time environment. The components may include a runtime catalog object that is accessed to provide configuration information. A runtime catalog object can call one or more table object dispensers. In other embodiments, an administration tool creates a logic table object to create client table objects that interface with catalog server objects. Both catalog server objects and table object dispensers can create a table system, which includes logic table objects that present the configuration data in a table format and data table objects created by the logic table objects. Data table objects are each bound to a datastore and expose the datastore to a table cursor to allow access to the configuration data through a table interface. The several objects provide abstraction between the datastore and a caller.

Lei describes a different system. Lei provides methods and mechanisms for accessing data in a database. Lei, col. 4, lines 17-19. More particularly, Lei provides a system for setting context attributes that are associated with a user session. Lei, col. 4, lines 19-24; col. 9, line 23- col. 10, lines 26. The context attributes may be set according to a policy that enforces certain access rules. Lei, col. 4, lines 23-25; col. 16, line 24 – col. 17, line 52. When a subsequent database query is received, the query predicates can be compared to the context attributes to determine whether and how to process the query. Lei, col. 4, lines 31-37; col. 7, lines 12 – col. 8, line 11.

Lei does not manage configuration information at runtime (or configuration time) for COM applications or services. In particular, Lei simply does not teach creation of table objects to abstract configuration information stored in several disparate datastores, wherein a data table object provides a table interface into the datastore. Thus, the newly amended claims are allowable over the asserted prior art.

For the forgoing reasons, Lei does not teach all the limitations of new claims 43 and 57 and therefore cannot anticipate the present invention as claimed. Claims 43 and 57 is allowable over the prior art of record and should be allowed. All other claims, *i.e.*, claims 44-56 and 58-75 depend from the allowable independent claims and are, thus, also allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance, for all claims, at his earliest convenience.

Conclusion

This Amendment fully responds to the Final Office Action mailed on September 12, 2005. Still, that Final Office Action may contain arguments and rejections and that are not directly addressed by this Amendment due to the fact that they are rendered moot in light of the

preceding arguments in favor of patentability. Hence, failure of this Amendment to directly address an argument raised in the Office Action should not be taken as an indication that the Applicant believes the argument has merit. Furthermore, the claims of the present application may include other elements, not discussed in this Amendment, which are not shown, taught, or otherwise suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, the preceding arguments in favor of patentability are advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

Enclosed is a Petition for Extension of Time in this matter, along with our check in the amount of \$1,020.00 as payment of the requisite fee for a large entity. It is believed that no further fees are due with this Response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment with respect to this patent application to deposit account number 13-2725.

In light of the above remarks and amendments, it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any additional issues need to be resolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attempt to resolve those issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2/27/06

27488



Tadd F. Wilson, #54,544
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
303.357.1651